Legi lation - Fideral

LAW DEFICES

SHOOK, HARDY, OTTMAN, MITCHELL & BACON

DIS GRAND AVENUE

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64106
TELEPHONE BALTIMORE (+36)

December 1, 1966

JOHN C. DODS
DONALD K. HODE
RUSCILL S. NOBLET
JAMES M. SMART
EVERITT A. OLSON, JR.
CHARLES T. CRAWFORD
DAVID W. SHINN
JOHN T. MARTIN
J. NEAL SAWYER, JR.
ROBERT K. WALDO

hilm?

TO:

DAM ELSEBRIE 1360-1956, ECOAR SHOON DAVID RIMARDY LAMES HIMTOHELL CHARLES LICACON DAVID HICLARN LAND CLEAR FRANK PISTERSE FREDERICK ELLL WILLIAM WISHINN

> Frederick P. Haas, Esq. Cy Hetsko, Esq. H. H. Ramm, Esq. Paul D. Smith, Esq. Addison Yeaman, Esq.

In accordance with your direction, the Ad Hoc Committee has prepared a draft of a position statement for use in connection with the possible Hearings in 1967. A copy is enclosed for each of you.

I will greatly appreciate it if you will take time to read this draft prior to the December 9 meeting, at which there will be a number of items that I will want to discuss with you.

There are, of course, and probably will continue to be, different views with regard to the scope of a position paper as well as the most desirable order and emphasis of points. The enclosed draft was prepared with the thought that we should put before you a statement that represents our affirmative position, without endeavoring therein to suggest and answer arguments that might be made against our position.

I have made separate assignments to members of the Ad Hoc Committee and others to prepare fact statements which are to be documented and which are designed to rebut arguments or points which might be advanced against us, but it was the consensus of Ad Hoc feeling that this material would be defensive and to incorporate it in a position paper would be to manufacture trouble.

General Counsel December 1, 1966 Page 2

You will note that the points raised in the enclosed paper have not been spelled out and argued in detail, and the authority for the statements has not been documented or footnoted. This, too, will be separately done.

I am most anxious to discuss with all of you at the December 9 meeting several points and arguments that could not be properly handled by our committee, at least until we have the best thinking of General Counsel.

I had hoped to distribute the enclosed paper to each of you at the meeting that was originally scheduled in Washington, December 1, and explain certain problems and possibilities before you read the statement. However, when the meeting was postponed to December 9, I chose, instead, to mail it to you on December 1, as promised, and to discuss it on December 9 after each of you have read it.

Sincerely,

David R. Hardy

DRH:WIM Enclosure

cc: Hon. Earle C. Clements